




15 July 2019



Via email: 

Dear 

**Response to official information request for information on steps built to roadside on Mungavin Avenue**

I refer to your request for official information received 17 June 2019 relating to long needed steps built to roadside on Mungavin Avenue. We have processed your request under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (LGOIMA) 1987.

This letter confirms Mike Evans' reply to you on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

The questions you specified have been included as numbered headings in bold below, with our response following each heading.

The plan for the steps arose out of observations on a Transport team inspection last year of a young mother walking down a muddy path down the bank. Other residents, like yourself, have expressed their pleasure that the issue is being addressed.

Although there is no requirement for PCC to consult for this type of work, we agree that it is good practice to inform the residents of the work planned and we apologise that this did not happen in this instance. As the work on the steps is well advanced, we cannot make changes to the basic design but we understand you have spoken to the construction team and are happy that mesh is going on the sides of the steps. The steps are of a reasonable width and solid design we believe. There will be a concrete pad at the bottom and I have asked the Transport team to initiate the bylaws process to put yellow no parking lines at the bottom – to ensure easy and safe access for pedestrians.

I have also asked the Transport team to investigate an additional light beside the steps as that area is not well lit.

**1. What efforts did the council make to inform affected residents:**

- As above, this did not happen unfortunately.

**2. Which residents did the council consult with before starting this build?**

- See above

**3. How have you obtained history of the area in order to make an informed decision regarding the design of these steps?**

- The site was inspected prior to the steps being designed and the design was agreed between Downer and PCC.

**4. Can you tell me why the steps aren't being built wider (than the standard 1200 cm) and at a diagonal?**

- The width of the steps is in keeping with the width of the adjacent path and other adjacent steps and we believe they are fit for purpose. The steps are perpendicular to the road, which seems sensible.

**5. Can you tell me why it is important to have these elements incorporated in the design?**

- We believe the step design is fit for purpose.

**6. What are the historical issues associated with this immediate area that would have determined an alternative design for these steps?**

- We are unaware of historical issues that would have determined an alternative design for these steps. If you feel that some changes to the current design would make a material difference to their functionality, we are happy to meet you on site to discuss further.

If you wish to discuss this decision with us, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Ngā mihi



Wendy Walker  
**Chief Executive**  
**Kaiwhakahaere Matua**